Case 3:16-mj-70454-MAG Document 9 Filed 04/14/16 Page 1 of 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

| SAN FI | RANCISCO DIVISION |
|--|---|
| United States of America, | RANCISCO DIVISION (Case No. CR 16-7) -070454 -MAG |
| Plaintiff, V. |) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT |
| SALJADOR LOMELT |)) |
| Defendant. | |
| For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on $\frac{2}{\sqrt{2}}$, 2016, the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from $\frac{2}{\sqrt{2}}$, 2016 to $\frac{2}{\sqrt{2}}$, 2016 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s): | |
| Failure to grant a continuance woul See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i). | ld be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. |
| defendants, the nature of the or law, that it is unreasonable to ex | ex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of exprosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact pect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial shed by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii). |
| | ld deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). |
| | Id unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given nmitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. |
| | |
| | APR 14 2016 |
| IT IS SO ORDERED. | SUSAN Y. SOONG SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK U.S. DISTRET GOURT CLERK U.S. DISTRET OF CALFORNIA |
| DATED: 4-14-14 | NORTHERN DISTILL |
| | SALLIE KIM United States Magistrate Judge |
| STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant | Assistant United States Attorney |
| Audiney for Defendant | Assistant Officer States Attorney |